



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/730,686	12/06/2000	Ana H. von Klopp Lemon	P5561/16159.002001	9223

32615 7590 08/25/2003

ROSENTHAL & OSHA L.L.P. / SUN
1221 MCKINNEY, SUITE 2800
HOUSTON, TX 77010

EXAMINER

BARQADLE, YASIN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2153

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2003

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Pre

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/730,686

Applicant(s)

VON KLOPP LEMON, ANA H.

Examiner

Yasin M Barqadle

Art Unit

2153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 23-51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 23-51 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ 6) ☐ Other: ____

Art Unit: 2153

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 23-51 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 23-25, 28-33, and 36-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yamane et al USPN. 6317786.

Art Unit: 2153

As per claim 23, Yamane et al teach a system for monitoring data flow in a web application hosted on a server, comprising (abstract):

a data collector which intercepts a HTTP request coming into the server and a HTTP response leaving the server in order to collect data passed between components of the web application [web traffic data is intercepted and collected as shown in table 3, col. 12, see col. 3, line 60 to col. 4, line 3]; and

a graphical display which displays the collected data [Fig. 6-9 and col. 21, lines 53-67].

As per claim 24, Yamane et al teach the system of claim 23, wherein the collected data comprises one selected from the group consisting of data contained in the HTTP request (table 3, #10 and 13), data contained in the HTTP response (col.3, lines 65-67), properties of a dynamic component invoked by the server to process the HTTP request (table 3, #7 and 8), data contained in a cookie associated with the HTTP request (table 3, #21), data contained in a cookie associated with the HTTP response (table 3, 9 which could include cookie), and combinations thereof [col. 12 line 37 to col. 13, line 17; see table 3, col. 12].

As per claim 25, Yamane et al teach the system of claim 24, wherein the collected data further comprises properties of a HTTP

Art Unit: 2153

session associated with the HTTP request [see table 3, #1,2, 13 and 14].

As per claim 28, Yamane et al teach the system of claim 23, further comprising a directory (database 112, fig.1) for storing the collected data [col. 20, lines 50 to col. 21, line 52].

As per claim 29, Yamane et al teach the system of claim 28, further comprising means for retrieving the data stored in the directory and for updating the graphical display with the data [col. 20, lines 50 to col. 21, line 52].

As per claim 30, Yamane et al teach the system of claim 29, further comprising means for deleting data associated with a selected HTTP request from the directory [col. 14, line 52].

As per claim 31, Yamane et al teach A system for monitoring data flow in a web application (abstract), comprising:

- a server which hosts the web application [fig. 1, web server 102];

- a data collector which intercepts (web traffic data is intercepted and collected as shown in table 3, col. 12) a HTTP request coming into the server and a HTTP response leaving the server in order to collect data passed between components of the web application [col. 3, line 60 to col. 4, line 3. see also col. 13, lines 19-63]; and

Art Unit: 2153

an application which provides a graphical display for displaying the collected data [Fig. 6-9 and col. 21, lines 53-67].

As per claim 32, Yamane et al teach the system of claim 31, wherein the collected data comprises one selected from the group consisting of data contained in the HTTP request (table 3, #10 and 13), data contained in the HTTP response (col.3, lines 65-67), properties of a dynamic component invoked by the server to process the HTTP request (table 3, #7 and 8), data contained in a cookie associated with the HTTP request (table 3, 21), data contained in a cookie associated with the HTTP response (table 3, 9 which could include cookie), and combinations thereof [col. 12 lines 37 to col. 13, line 17; see table 3, col. 12].

As per claim 33, Yamane et al teach the system of claim 32, wherein the collected data further comprises properties of a HTTP session associated with the HTTP request [see table 3, 1,2, 13 and 14].

As per claim 36, Yamane et al teach a system for test-running and debugging a web application, comprising:

a server which hosts the web application [fig. 1, web server 102];

Art Unit: 2153

a client requesting resources from the server [col. 4, lines 50-54];

a data collector which intercepts an HTTP request sent by the client to the server and a corresponding HTTP response sent by the server to the client in order to collect data passed between components of the web application [col. 3, lines 60 to col. 4, line 3. see also col. 13, lines line 19-63]; and

an application that provides a graphical display for displaying the collected data [Fig. 6-9 and col. 21, line 53-67].

As per claim 37, Yamane et al teach the system of claim. 36, wherein the collected data comprises one selected from the group consisting of data contained in the HTTP request (table 3, 10 and 13), data contained in the HTTP response (col.3, lines 65-67), properties of a dynamic component invoked by the server to process the HTTP request (table 3, 7 and 8), data contained in a cookie associated with the HTTP request (table 3, 21), data contained in a cookie associated with the HTTP response (table 3, 9 which could include cookie), and combinations thereof [col. 12 lines 37 to col. 13, line 17; see table 3, col. 12].

As per claim 38, Yamane et al teach the system of claim 37, further comprising an integrated development environment which starts the server in a separate process [col. 6, lines 46-65].

Art Unit: 2153

As per claim 39, Yamane et al teach the system of claim 38, wherein the graphical display is accessible from within the integrated development environment col. 6, lines 46 to col. 7, line 49].

As per claim 40, Yamane et al teach the system of claim 38, wherein the client is accessible from within the integrated development environment [col. 6, lines 46 to line 49 and col. 20, lines 50 to col. 21, line 52].

As per claim 41, Yamane et al teach the system of claim 38, wherein the integrated development environment comprises a mechanism that listens for requests from external processes and updates the graphical display in response to a notification from the data collector [col. 16, lines 32-40].

As per claim 42, Yamane et al teach the system of claim 37, further comprising a directory (database 112) for storing the collected data [col. 20, lines 50 to col. 21, line 52].

As per claim 43, Yamane et al teach the system of claim 42, further comprising a mechanism running as part of the client which updates the graphical display with the data stored in the directory [col. 5, lines 46-60].

Art Unit: 2153

As per claim 44, Yamane et al teach a system for test-running and debugging a web application comprising:

a server which hosts the web application [fig. 1, web server 102];

an integrated development environment which starts the server in a separate process; a client requesting resources from the server [col. 14, lines 26-49];

a data collector which intercepts an HTTP request sent by the client to the server and a corresponding HTTP response sent by the server to the client in order to collect data passed between components of the web application [web traffic data is intercepted and collected as shown in table 3; col. 12 col. 3, lines 60 to col. 4, line 3]; and

an application that provides a graphical display for displaying the collected data [Fig. 6-9 and col. 21, line 53-67].

As per claim 45, Yamane et al teach the system of claim 44, wherein the collected data comprises one selected from the group consisting of data contained in the HTTP request (table 3, 10 and 13), data contained in the HTTP response (col.3, lines 65-67), properties of a dynamic component invoked by the server to process the HTTP request (table 3, 7 and 8), data contained in a cookie associated with the HTTP request (table 3, 21), data contained in a cookie associated with the HTTP response (table 3, 9 which could include cookie), and combinations thereof [col. 12 lines 37 to col. 13, line 17; see table 3, col. 12].

As per claim 46, Yamane et al teach the system of claim 45, wherein the collected data further comprises properties of a HTTP session associated with the HTTP request [see table 3, 1,2, 13 and 14].

As per claim 47, Yamane et al teach a method for monitoring data flow in a web application (abstract), comprising:

- sending a HTTP request to a server hosting the web application [col. 4, lines 50-54];

- receiving a HTTP response from the server [col. 3, lines 60 to col. 4, line 3];

- intercepting the HTTP request and the HTTP response on the server in order to collect data passed between components of the web application [col. 7, lines 6-28]; and
- displaying the collected data on a graphical display [Fig. 6-9 and col. 21, line 53-67].

As per claim 48, Yamane et al teach the method of claim 47, wherein the collected data comprises one selected from the group consisting of data contained in the HTTP request (table 3, 10 and 13), data contained in the HTTP response (col.3, lines 65-67), properties of a dynamic component invoked by the server to process the HTTP request (table 3, 7 and 8), data contained in a cookie associated with the HTTP request (table 3, 21), data contained in a cookie associated with the HTTP response (table 3,

Art Unit: 2153

9 which could include cookie), and combinations thereof [col. 12 lines 37 to col. 13, line 17; see table 3, col. 12].

As per claim 49, Yamane et al teach the method of claim 48, wherein the collected data further comprises properties of a HTTP session associated with the HTTP request [see table 3, 1,2, 13 and 14].

As per claim 50, Yamane et al teach the method of claim 47, wherein the HTTP request is intercepted prior to the server making any modifications to the HTTP request [col. 7, lines 30-49 and col. 12, line 37-46].

As per claim 51, Yamane et al teach the method of claim 50, wherein the HTTP response is intercepted prior to the server making any modifications to the HTTP response [col. 12, line 37-46 and col. 12, line 37-46].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at

Art Unit: 2153

hooks (as for the hooks see the rejection made above in claim 26) in a plug-in on the server to intercept the HTTP request and HTTP response in order to collect data [col. 6, lines 22-36].

Conclusion

The prior made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yasin M Barqadle whose telephone number is 703-305-5971. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Burgess can be reached on 703-305-9717. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-304-3900.

Yasin Barqadle
August 20, 2003



KRISNA LIM
PRIMARY EXAMINER